

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated April 27, 2004.

The specification has been amended to correct all possible minor errors.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-3 have been canceled and replaced with new claim 4 in order to avoid this rejection.

Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by either one of Franklin, et al (US 5,355,784) or Hsu (US 5,421,248). Furthermore, the Examiner has stated that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1-3 have been canceled and replaced with new claim 4 which is rewritten from claim 3 to overcome the rejections(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The applicant has reviewed the prior art as cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection and believes that the new claim clearly and distinctly patentably defines over such prior art.

10

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition of allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Signature

Leong C. Lei

Registration No. 50402

July 27, 2004